



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,673	10/30/2001	Jay S. Dweck	G08.011	4001

28062 7590 12/27/2004

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC
5 ELM STREET
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

EXAMINER

RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/016,673

Applicant(s)

DWECK ET AL.

Examiner

Susan F. Rayyan

Art Unit

2167

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/30/01, 1/13/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 30, 2001, and January 13, 2003 have been considered.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following: in section entitled "Cross-Reference to Related Applications" update to include all related applications and their status.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the method of claim 20" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 20 depends from itself therefore Examiner has interpreted the claim as depending from claim 18.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "selection tags" in line 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 2167

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technical art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-2,4-12,15-16,18-19,22,25-26,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al (US 6,098,066) in view of Anderson et al (US 6,510,434).**

As per claims 1,24,27 Snow teaches:
receiving information from a content reader at col.7, lines 60-62;
establishing a set of content selection ... based on the received information, each
content selection tag in the set being associated with a hierarchical ... domain at col.8,
lines 49-58;

and arranging for the content reader to receive an indication of a document in accordance with the set of content selection tags at fig.7, #114.

Snow does not explicitly teach tags however Anderson does teach this limitation at col.2, line 53, bridging to, col.3, line 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to perform a search in an efficient manner and support searching in multiple databases at col.2, lines 27-30.

As per claim 2 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches: wherein at least one tag domain comprises a multi-level domain, and at least one domain level is associated with a plurality of content selection tags at col.4, lines 34-43.

As per claim 4 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches: wherein at least one content selection tag is associated with at least one of an industry ... at col.8, lines 13-50 and col. 10 lines 24-50.

As per claim 5 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches: receiving a plurality of selection tags via a graphical user interface at col.6, lines 65-67 and col.1, lines 23-25.

As per claim 6 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches: wherein content selection tags are further associated with Boolean operations in accordance with the information received from the content reader at col.7, lines 60-62.

As per claim 7 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches: wherein the set of content selection ... is adapted to facilitate selection of the document in accordance with a set of document ... at col.8, lines 49-58.

As per claim 8 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches:
wherein the set of documents tags are established in accordance with information received from a content publisher via a graphical user interface at col.8, lines 49-60.

As per claim 9 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:
wherein document tags are associated with hierarchical tag domains substantially similar to the tag domains associated with the set of content selection tags at col.4, lines 44-50.

As per claim 10 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:
wherein at least one document tag comprises at least one of: (i) a primary tag, and (ii) a secondary tag at col.4, lines 44-50.

As per claim 11 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:
wherein the document comprises content to be provided to a user via a communication network at fig. 1A.

As per claim 12 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:
wherein the communication network comprises at least one of: (i) the Internet, (ii) an intranet, (iii) a public network, (iv) a public switched telephone network, (v) a proprietary network, (vi) a wireless network, and (vii) a local area network at fig. 1A.

As per claim 15 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:
further comprising: transmitting the document to the content reader at fig. 1A.

As per claim 16 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:
wherein said transmitting is performed via at least one of: (i) a content controller, (ii) a content publisher, (iii) a content reader, (iv) a personal computer, (v) a server, (vi) a

Art Unit: 2167

portable computing device, (vii) a wireless telephone, (viii) a Web site, and (ix) an electronic mail message at fig. 1A.

As per claim 18 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches:
storing the set of content selection tags in association with the content reader at col.8, lines 55-57.

As per claim 19 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches:
wherein the set of content selection tags comprises a first set of content selection tags and further comprising: receiving additional information from the content reader, and establishing a second set of content selection tags based on the additional information; and storing the second set of content selection tags in association with the content reader at col.8, lines 57-58.

As per claim 22 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches:
further comprising: receiving additional information from the content reader; and storing a modified set of content selection tags in association with the content reader based on the additional information at col.8, lines 49-58.

As per claim 25 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:
wherein said storage device further stores at least one of: (i) a tag database, (ii) a document database, and (iii) a content reader database at 1b.

As per claim 26 same as claim arguments above and Anderson teaches:

a communication device coupled to said processor and adapted to communicate with at least one of: (i) a content publishing device, (ii) a document storage device, (iii) a content controller, (iv) a content reader device, and (v) a payment device at fig.1b.

As per independent claim 28 Snow teaches:

A method of accessing documents at summary;

transmitting information to a content controller via a graphical user interface at col.8, lines 49-58;

and receiving an indication of a document in accordance with a set of content selection tags established based on the transmitted information, each content selection ... in the set being associated with a hierarchical ... domain at col.8, lines 49-58.

Snow does not explicitly teach tags however Anderson does teach this limitation at col.2, line 53, bridging to, col.3, line 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to perform a search in an efficient manner and support searching in multiple databases at col.2, lines 27-30.

8. Claims 3,13,20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al (US 6,098,066) in view of Anderson et al (US 6,510,434) and further in view of Husick et al (US 5,717,914).

As per claim 3 same as claim arguments above and Snow and Anderson do not explicitly teach wherein at least one content selection tag is associated with at least one of (i) a content author, (ii) a content date, and (iii) a content type however Husick does

Art Unit: 2167

teach this limitation at fig.5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to identify documents and multimedia files corresponding to a search at col.3, lines 61-65.

As per claim 13 same as claim arguments above and Snow and Anderson do not explicitly teach wherein the document comprises at least one of: (i) text content, (ii) image content, (iii) audio content, and (iv) executable content however Husick does teach this limitation at summary. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to identify documents and multimedia files corresponding to a search at col.3, lines 61-65.

As per claim 20 same as claim arguments above and Snow and Anderson do not explicitly teach wherein the first set of content selection ... is associated with a first portion of a reader display and the second set of content selection ... is associated with a second portion of the reader display however Husick does teach this limitation at fig. 4B. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to provide a means to efficiently display multiple documents to a user by displaying the documents simultaneously.

As per claim 21 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches: receiving from the content reader a selection of one at least of the first and second sets of content selection ... and transmitting to the content reader an indication of a document in accordance with the selected set of content selection ... at col.8, lines 49-58.

9. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al (US 6,098,066) in view of Anderson et al (US 6,510,434) in view of Husick et al (US 5,717,914) and further in view of Beaulieu et al (US 5,502,637).

As per independent claim 23 Snow teaches:

receiving from a content reader an indication of a first content selection ... set via a graphical user interface, the first content selection ... set being adapted to facilitate identification of a first investment research document in accordance with a first document ... set at col. 8, lines 49-58;

receiving from the content reader an indication of a second content selection ... set, the second content selection ... set being adapted to facilitate identification of a second ... document in accordance with a second document ... set at col.8, lines 48-60;

Snow does not explicitly teach tags however Anderson does teach this limitation at col.2, line 53, bridging to, col.3, line 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to perform a search in an efficient manner and support searching in multiple databases at col.2, lines 27-30.

Snow and Anderson do not explicitly teach arranging for an indication of the first ... document to be displayed via a first portion of a content reader display and arranging for an indication of the second ... document to be displayed via a second portion of the content reader display however Husick does teach this limitation at fig. 4B. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine the cited references to provide a means to efficiently display multiple documents to a user by displaying the documents simultaneously.

Snow, Anderson and Husick do not explicitly teach investment research document however Beaulieu does teach this limitation at col.1, lines 19-24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to enable searching current and archive reports at col.1, lines 48-51.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al (US 6,098,066) in view of Anderson et al (US 6,510,434) in view of Beaulieu et al (US 5,502,637).

As per claim 14 same as claim arguments above and Snow and Anderson do not explicitly teach wherein the content comprises at least one of: (i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information however Beaulieu does teach this limitation at col.1, lines 19-24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to enable searching current and archive reports at col.1, lines 48-51.

11. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al (US 6,098,066) in view of Anderson et al (US 6,510,434) and further in view of Freiwirth et al (US 2001/0037317).

As per claim 17 same as claim arguments above and Snow teaches:

Art Unit: 2167

wherein the set of content selection tags is associated with at least one of: (i) a content reader request at col.8, lines 49-58. Snow and Anderson do not explicitly teach an entitlement tag however Freiwrth does teach this limitation at parg. 57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to determine how the information is viewed by the community and viewing rights at parg. 57, lines 1-2.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4117. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for Official communications, (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications and (703) 746-7240 for Status inquiries and draft communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Susan Rayyan



December 10, 2004


Primary Examiner